

Rubin 1999-0728

REMARKS

Claims 1-14, 17, 20, 21, 23-27, 32-34, 41, and 42 were rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Beck et al, US patent 6,167,395 in view of Flores et al, US Patent 5,216,603. This is the same rejection that applicants addressed in the previous amendment, and applicants still respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants also respectfully note the Examiner has not responded to argument that applicants put forth relative to a number of the claims, leaving a situation where the rejection of the claims appears to be unjustified.

Basically, the Beck et al system is directed to an arrangement where a multi-media call center (MMCC) receives incoming communication from customers who deal with an attendant, an interactive voice response system (voice calls) or a computer (emails, file attachments, etc.), and apparently the system stores the "data entities" (Abstract) that it receives in a "data repository" (Abstract). In order to allow retrieval of the stored information, this information apparently is stored in some association with "association criteria" that the attendant of the MMCC who reviews the communication supplies, so that the data repository can be searched by providing a search term and thereby retrieving data entities that have the search term as one of the association criteria that are associated with the retrieved records.

In contradistinction, claim 1, in its broadest interpretation, specifies

1. adding at least a portion of a communication session to a corpus,
2. augmenting a list of keywords after the communication session, and
3. then processing the communication session by using of the augmented list.

In the remarks, the Examiner asserts that Bell et al teach

selecting keywords related to said communication session for subsequently searching to find said communication session (abstract).

Actually, the abstract simply teaches that the user is provided with means to "enter association criteria," and that there is "a search function that searches accessed data for association criteria and notes those data entities that meet the association criteria." It is noted, however, that this is NOT a teaching of a keyword list, or of augmenting a list of keywords. These are criteria that are used in a manner that allows a data entity to be retrieved by specifying one of those association criteria, but does not require the existence of a list.

Rubin 1999-0728

Even if one were to argue that the entered "association criteria"¹ form a list, it is not teaching of an arrangement where a list is augmented. Once the record is stored in association with the association criteria, those association criteria need not be kept.

The Examiner also states that Beck et al teach "keyword summarization (col. 9, lines 38-51)." First it is respectfully pointed out that none of the claims specify any kind of keyword summarization and, therefore, it is immaterial whether the reference teach keyword summarization or not. Secondly, while it is not known what the Examiner means by "keyword summarization," and the cited passage does not use this phrase, it is respectfully submitted that the cited paragraph teaches nothing that can be considered "keyword summarization" because the cited paragraph states:

It is important to note here that the text-based version of an event may or may not be a complete and verbatim rendition of an actual media event. For example, an e-mail may contain many documents each having many pages of text. Therefore, the text-based version of a particular e-mail event may simply contain the name and particulars regarding the author, a purchase order, and a list of the enclosed documents by title, and basic content or memo as well as a possible manual annotation. The attachments to the e-mail may be stored separately, and be also cross-indexed and retrievable. Seeing the purchase order when the event is routed to an agent desktop tells the agent that this e-mail is important.

Clearly, this passage speaks of data entities from the communication session itself that are stored (e.g., text-based version of an event, email attachments, etc.), and does not even mention any association criteria, much less mentioning any augmenting of a search keywords list, or summarization of anything.

Regarding the augmented list of keywords, the Examiner asserts that

Beck discusses an augmented keyword list (col. 46, lines 5-48) and notes that

the augmented keyword list is not only stored, but enhanced during the communication system between the user and the system performing a search function.

¹ As taught in the Summary, the association criteria can be individual and combinations of key words, phrases, text strings, date of occurrence, time of occurrences, media type, participant characteristics, duration of interaction, and participant initiation.

Rubin 1999-0728

Respectfully, applicants see so no such teaching in the col. 46, lines 5-48 passage. The cited passage consists of 3 paragraph, where the search function is discussed in the first paragraph, the capability of search function 330 to identify media icons (presumably, in contrast to identifying text) is discussed in the second paragraph, and transaction monitors and their ability to employ the search terms, like the search function 330, to “live interactions as well as recent not-live text transactions that have yet to be entered into a repository such as repository 321” (col. 46, lines 45-46) are discussed in the third paragraph. In other words, the passage cited by the Examiner does not teach a list of keywords, does not teach an augmented list of keywords, and it is totally not clear what “enhancement” the Examiner views to be occurring.

There is no explicit teaching in Beck et al that the keywords that are provided by the MMCC attendant are stored, but it is clear that a data repository is created in such a way that search terms that are submitted by the search module are able to retrieve the data entities in connection with which the keywords were provided. So it appears that the keywords need to be somehow set apart in the data repository. While Beck et al to not explicitly teach a database, as noted by the Examiner, it is tempting to suggest – as the Examiner has suggested in citing Flores et al that the keywords could be used to index the “data entities” in a database so that they can be retrieved in response to a search. However, the indexing in a database does not translate to a teaching of a list of keywords.

As to item 3 in the above list of claim 1 attributes “processing the communication session by using of the augmented list,” the Examiner is totally silent! It should be noted, however, that this attribute represents a very significant difference in operation, and it is the reason why one needs a keyword list.

According to the Beck et al arrangement, a call comes in, is recorded, and digitized. The attendant identifies various association criteria (e.g., who is the caller, date and time of the call, keywords – such as dispute billing, or shipment not arrived) and the digital version of the call (or some portion thereof) is stored in a “data repository” so that it can be retrieved in the future by using any of the association criteria. In contradistinction, according to claim 1, a customer/individual using the customer’s network terminal participates in a communication session, the corpus of the communication session is added to the corpus of previous calls, the customer/individual

Rubin 1999-0728

supplies keywords (or keywords are generated automatically from the communication session by use of artificial intelligence) and then the communication session is processed using the words submitted or generated in that communication session AND using all previously submitted or generated keywords². Beck et al describe or suggest no such notion anywhere, and neither does Flores et al, US Patent 5,216,603 (and the Examiner does not assert that it does).

Based on the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Beck et al taken together with Flores et al, and the same applies to all claims that depend on claim 1.

Other than the assertions addressed above, the Examiner provided no comments directed to claim 14, which is a Jepson-type claim. As mentioned in the previous amendment, "the Examiner is obliged to consider the entirety of the preamble in claim 14." When so considered, it is clear that the claim is directed to an arrangement that services an individual customer rather than a commercial establishment. It is respectfully submitted that no one has realized the need for an arrangement such as the one defined in claim 14 and, therefore, the claim is not obvious in view of the cited references. It is noted that the Examiner has not asserted otherwise, so it is not clear why claim 14 stands rejected. Moreover, the attributes that are present in claim 1 and which are demonstrated above to make claim 1 not obvious are also present in claim 14 and, for this reason as well, claim 14 is not obvious in view of the Beck et al and Flores et al combination of references.

As for independent claim 17, applicants argued the merits of claim 17 in the previous office action. This Office action seems to completely ignore applicants' arguments. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner review applicants' previous amendment. Substantively, claim 17 specifies a system with a "module for personal use by an individual to communicate with another party" (first clause of the claims). In rejecting claim 17 the Examiner failed to even assert that the Beck et al system has anything that corresponds to this module. But, since the Beck et al system is a MMCC, any element of the Beck et al system that could possibly correspond to this

² And that is why an augmented list of keywords is needed.

Rubin 1999-0728

module would necessarily equate the "individual" with an attendant of the MMCC.

Claim 17 further specifies

collection module that collects and stores a communication session where said individual is one of the participants and excludes communication by said other party (emphasis supplied)

Such a collection module in Beck et al would have to be a module that records the communication from the MMCC attendant and excludes communication to the MMCC. There is no such element in the Beck et al system, and such an element would be wholly contrary to the entire purpose of the Beck et al system. Therefore, claim 17 is not obvious in view of the Beck et al and Flores et al combination of references, and neither are the claims that depend on claim 17.

Claims 41 and 42 are canceled to advance prosecution.

In light of the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that all of the Examiner's rejections have been overcome. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully,
Aviel D. Rubin
Martin J. Strauss

Dated: 11/8/07

By 

Henry T. Brendzel
Reg. No. 26,844
Phone (973) 467-2025
Fax (973) 467-6589
email brendzel@comcast.net